

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

# A CENTENNIAL OF THE CHURCH IN ST. LOUIS (1818-1918)

The Fifth of January, 1918, brought to the city of St. Louis the centenary of the coming and installation of Bishop Du Bourg. It marked also the hundredth anniversary of the establishment there of a permanent clergy.[1] The date is of more than mere local interest, for the double event just mentioned may be truly said to have inaugurated a new era in the history of the Church in the immense territory west of the Mississippi River.

In the beginning of 1818, St. Louis was only a little town of some two thousand inhabitants,[2] and could scarcely be regarded a religious center in the Louisiana Diocese, as most of the Catholics were in the South; moreover, New Orleans, the logical cathedral city, had been an Episcopal See in Spanish times, and the residence of Du Bourg himself during the years of his Administratorship (1812–1815). What motives, therefore, led the Bishop of Louisiana to settle in that out-of-the-way place?

The investigation of these motives, the account of the various steps which culminated in the Prelate's decision, and the recital of the circumstances attending his actual installation in St. Louis, is the object of this paper.

Appointed Administrator-apostolic of Louisiana by Archbishop Carroll on August 18, 1812, Father Louis William Du Bourg had worked strenuously, for well-nigh three years, to bring order into the vast Diocese committed to his charge. His

---

[1] Bishop Spalding, in his *Sketches of the Life, Times and Character of Bishop Flaget*, p. 136, gives the list of all the priests "who held pastoral charge of St. Louis from its foundation;" and in this list we find the indication: "1811–1817, Rev. F. Savine." Father Savine was then pastor of Cahokia, and attended St. Louis as an out-mission, the third Sunday of every month. Rev. Joseph Rosati's name follows that of Father Savine for the year 1817. Father Rosati came to St. Louis on October 17, 1817, with Bishop Flaget and Father De Andreis for the purpose of making preparations in view of the reception of Bishop Du Bourg, and stayed there about a week. The parish register mentions only four baptisms performed by him during that time, he never held pastoral charge in St. Louis.

[2] Recollections of John F. Darby in WALTER B. STEVENS' *St. Louis the Fourth City*, 1764–1909, Vol. i, p. 117. St. Louis, 1909. Two-thirds of the population were French and one-third Americans. There may have been four to five hundred negroes, but these were not, it appears, registered in the census. The prevailing language of the white people was French; all the colored people spoke French.

was almost a superhuman task. To begin with, his jurisdiction extended not only over the whole of the Louisiana Purchase, but over the Floridas as well. The immense territory, known as Upper Louisiana, was then but sparsely populated and gave little trouble to the ecclesiastical authorities; moreover, the Bishop of Bardstown had consented to look after its spiritual welfare. But the Floridas were an apple of discord between the Administrator and the Bishop of Havana. At the time of the erection of the See of New Orleans (1793), when Louisiana was a Spanish possession, the Floridas, which were likewise a dependency of the crown of Spain, had been annexed to the new Diocese. But after the retrocession of Louisiana to France, and its sale by Bonaparte to the United States, the Bishop of Havana, on the plea that Spanish lands ought to be ruled by Spanish Bishops, pretended that Florida had reverted to his Diocese. Archbishop Carroll and Father Du Bourg, on the other hand, challenged this claim; and even though Rome upheld their view, it was no easy matter to persuade the tenacious Cuban prelate to relinquish his title.

These, however, were trifling difficulties compared to the troubles which the Administrator had to contend with at home, in Lower Louisiana. In that portion of the Diocese, which numbered more than 50,000 Catholics,[3] there were only eleven parishes,[4] and not enough priests to attend them all. It is not strange, therefore, that, "many Catholics die without sacraments, many children unbaptized; others scarce see a priest once in a lifetime; marriages are contracted without blessing, Christian doctrine is not taught, and such a decay of Christian life is to be observed, that within a few years the Catholic faith will be entirely obliterated."[5] Darker still is the picture of the conditions in New Orleans: "There is rife in that city a spirit of unbelief, or rather of godlessness, which is gradually corrupting the whole

[3] A note in the Archives of Propaganda: *Scritture referite nei Congressi. America Centrale.* Codice 4. *Notizia de Luigiana,* gives the total number of Catholics in the whole Diocese as 150,000, certainly too high a figure; the estimate of Bishop Du Bourg (60,000) is, no doubt, much nearer the truth.

[4] New Orleans, Terre-aux-Boeufs, St. Charles, St. John Baptist, St. James, Ascension, St. Gabriel, Pointe-Coupée, St. Martin, Natchitoches and Natchez.

[5] *Notizia.*

mass. This plague is to be attributed to the coming of a great number of free-masons and hucksters of every description, to the spread of French maxims, to infrequent preaching of the word of God, to love of lucre and pleasure, so much intensified by the climate and the number of female slaves, above all to the scandals given by the clergy."[6]

These last words, however, ought not to be understood as applying to the entire clergy. Of the five priests then living in New Orleans, three are singled out, birds of a feather whom analogous instincts moved to flock together and who made the cathedral their eyrie: the Spanish Capuchin Rector, Anthony de Sedella—Père Antoine, as he was commonly called—for years the head of a clique opposed to the new order of things created by the Louisiana Purchase, and his two notorious assistants, the whilom Recollect John Kuana (Kuhn?) and the ex-Dominican Père Thomas.

And to make things yet worse, at the gates of the city stood an English army ready to attack it.

Amidst such trying circumstances, Father Du Bourg had met with partial success. His attitude during the crucial moments of the war had won him the respect of the saner part of the people and that of public officials, General Jackson in particular; at the same time, the opposition had somewhat abated, at least momentarily, when the ringleader, Father Anthony, yielded a kind of recognition to the Administrator's authority. But all this did not compensate the havoc wrought by death among the clergy: "They die like flies," wrote Du Bourg to Bishop Flaget. In the eighteen months since his arrival,[7] four priests of the Diocese had passed away, so that ten only remained, *tant bons, indifférents, que mauvais*—two over sixty, and three above seventy years of age.

The treaty of Ghent (December 24, 1814) and the crushing defeat of General Packenham at New Orleans having now cleared the ocean of hostile vessels, Father Du Bourg resolved to go directly to lay before the Pope the pressing needs of the flock entrusted to his care. "Were it necessary," he said to

---

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] The letter containing these details is dated December, 1814.

Bishop Flaget, "I would go to China, either to be relieved of this terrible burden, or to seek necessary aid to enable me to bear it properly." He would make an earnest appeal for evangelical laborers, and, if unsuccessful, would request the Holy Father to accept his resignation. At any rate, he would provide for Upper Louisiana by asking its dismemberment from New Orleans and its union to the See of Bardstown.

The news of his approaching departure at once rekindled the fire of the smouldering opposition; and a spirited correspondence on the lawfulness of the appointment of Father Louis Sibourd as Vicar General was exchanged between the Cathedral and the Ursuline Convent where Father Du Bourg made his residence. The Administrator had announced to Father Anthony the Vicar General's appointment in the following note:[8]

*New Orleans, April* 29, 1815.

*Reverend Father:*

Being about to start for Europe, whereto the urgent needs of the Diocese entrusted to my care compel me to go, I have the honor to notify you that I have appointed the Rev. Louis Sibourd my Vicar General, to administer the Diocese during my absence, and that, accordingly, he is the person to whom all things within the pale of Ecclesiastical authority should be referred. I have in regard of this appointment all the necessary faculties.

I am respectfully,
Reverend Father,
Your servant
WM. DU BOURG.

Two days later, Father de Sedella replied to the Administrator:

*New Orleans, May* 1, 1815.

*Reverend Administrator Apostolic:*

In order to enable me to answer with proper accuracy your favor of the 29th ult., received yesterday, I beg you kindly to show me your letter of appointment as Administrator Apostolic, and the new faculties received by you subsequently which empower you to appoint a Vicar General for the time of your absence; otherwise neither my honor nor my ministry allow me to comply with your ordinance.

Moreover, you are certainly aware that all title-letters and like faculties should be entered and preserved in the Archives of this church, in order that they might be authenticated by this formality—which has not been done hitherto.

I beg, etc., P. ANTHONY DE SEDELLA, *Rector.*

[8] *Arch. of Prop., l. c.*, Cod. 3. *ff.* 330.

Without delay, Father Du Bourg penned the following reply:

*Reverend Father:*

Being desirous not to leave the least shadow of difficulty remain over the faculty by virtue of which I have appointed the Rev. Louis Sibourd Vicar General to take my place pending the indispensable journey which I am about to make to Europe in the interest of the Diocese, I am sending you a copy of my letter of appointment certified and registered at the office of Mr. Narcisse Brontio, Notary Public.[9] You will notice, Reverend

[9] Although the text of the Pontifical Brief to Bishop Carroll and that of Bishop Carroll's letter to Father Du Bourg are well known, it may not be out of place to give them here.

*To our Venerable Brother the Archbishop of Baltimore, PIUS VII, POPE.*

Venerable Brother, Health and the Apostolic Blessing.

The solicitude wherewith the Roman Pontiff must look after the whole church of God cannot allow any part of the vineyard planted by the eternal Son of the Father to be without labourers, in order that by their work and unremitting zeal the true faith, which is one as God himself is One, should be firmly maintained and spread ever farther, and the spiritual harvest of souls increased to the hundredfold. Some time ago, We provided for the Church of New Orleans, that is, of Louisiana, in North America, bereft of its Pastor and Bishop, by committing that Church to your Ordinary jurisdiction, dear Brother, until We and this Holy See may find an opportunity to make some more satisfactory arrangement. As this opportunity is not yet forthcoming, and you have enough other heavy burdens to care for, We, therefore, pursuant to the advice of our Venerable Brethren the Cardinals of the Congregation of Propaganda, in order that nothing demanded by the spiritual necessity or interest of the faithful residing in those parts should be left undone, instruct and enjoin you, Venerable Brother, if before the Lord you deem this measure expedient, to delegate and send by our Apostolic authority to the aforesaid State of Louisiana, in the capacity of Administrator Apostolic and with the rights of an Ordinary, for as long a space of time as shall be this Holy See's pleasure, and according to the instruction which shall be forwarded you by the above-mentioned Congregation, either our Beloved Son Charles Nerinckx, in whose zeal and virtue We have absolute confidence, or, if perchance he should deem himself unequal to the task, another capable priest, well known by you, secular or regular;—all things to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome, at St. Mary Major, under the seal of the Fisherman, April 6, 1808. L. Card. ANTONELLI.

*Very Rev. William Du Bourg,*

President of St. Mary's College, Baltimore.

I, the undersigned, Archbishop of Baltimore, fully cognizant of your faith, the sterling quality of your conduct and doctrine, your tireless zeal for the care of souls, and your masterful preaching of the word of God, by virtue of the above Pontifical Brief, delegate and send you, Very Rev. Wm. Du Bourg, to the Diocese of New Orleans, that is, of the State of Louisiana, in order that you may, by Apostolic authority, rule this same Diocese in the capacity of Administrator Apostolic, and with the rights of an Ordinary, for as long a space of time as shall be the Sovereign Pontiff's and Holy See's good pleasure. In the Name of the Most Holy Trinity, One God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Amen.

Given at Baltimore under our Great Seal, on August 18, 1812.

✠John, *Archbishop of Baltimore.*

Father, that in this letter the Pope gives to the priest whom the Most Reverend Archbishop of Baltimore may, by virtue of the Pontifical Brief, eventually appoint, the title of Administrator Apostolic of Louisiana, revocable only by the Holy See. I am, therefore, by the choice which this Prelate made of me, the Pope's immediate delegate, and, as such, have received from His Holiness all the rights appertaining to the Ordinary: *cum juribus Ordinarii.*

Now, that such persons as are delegated by the Pope to an office of jurisdiction, have the right to subdelegate the faculties attached to this office, is incontrovertible. So affirms Cabassut in his *Théorie et Pratique du Droit Canonique*, l. iv, c. 1, No. 11: *Delegati a Papa subdelegare possunt quando eis collata fuit potestas per modum jurisdictionis;* and he cites as his authority the *Cap. fin. de Off. et Potest. judic. deleg.*

Conformably to this principle universally admitted by canonists, the Pope, in the general faculties which he sends to all the Prefects of Missions, Vicars Apostolic, etc., closes with these words: *praedictas facultates communicandi sacerdotibus idoneis, ut, sede vacante, sit qui possit supplere donec Sedes Apostolica certior facta alio modo provideat.*

These last words deserve attention. They prove that it is the Church's intention 1° that its jurisdiction be not interrupted anywhere; 2° that this jurisdiction be transmitted, at least provisionally, by him who is in possession thereof. From this it follows that not only the Pope's immediate delegate, but subdelegates themselves have the right to appoint their successors, or substitutes, when they are compelled to discontinue the exercise of their authority, and this until other provision be made by the Sovereign Pontiff.

Thus, by virtue of this power, founded on the very constitution of the Church, the Prefects Apostolic in the Missions have always appointed one or two vice-prefects in their stead. This is a well-known fact.

By itself, the clause *cum juribus Ordinarii* qualifying my office in the Brief of His Holiness, unequivocally says as much. In Ecclesiastical parlance the Ordinary, or the Bishop, are one and the same thing, so far as jurisdiction is concerned. I am, then, in possession of all the jurisdictional rights of the Bishop. Like the Bishop, therefore, I am empowered to communicate my faculties to another; for this power is not a privilege of Order, but a consequence of jurisdiction, as is manifest from the fact that a Bishop-elect, even before his consecration, can appoint a Vicar General.

In point of fact, what am I doing, when I appoint a Pastor, but communicating to him my jurisdiction over a part of the territory assigned to me? Now if I can thus apportion my jurisdiction piecemeal, is it not evident that I can commit to another the whole of it as well?

I trust, Reverend Father, that the above remarks will satisfy you. The Rev. Rectors of the Diocese have already manifested their readiness to acknowledge Father Sibourd as provisional superior during my absence and until the proper authorities appoint some one else. Your refusing

to acknowledge his authority would eventually result in the nullity of all marriages in need of a dispensation from diriment impediments.

I am respectfully,
Reverend Father,
Your most humble and devoted servant
WM. DU BOURG.

*New Orleans, May 2,* 1815.

The Administrator's lucid Canon Law dissertation elicited this astonishing rejoinder:

*Reverend Administrator Apostolic:*

As I am by inclination a lover of peace and a punctual observer of the orders of my lawful superiors, as you well know, allow me to state candidly that neither from your special letter of appointment by the Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore, nor from the letter sent at the same time by the same Most Rev. Gentleman to Father John Olivier, can anything else be taken, but that you are a mere subdelegate, without any other faculties than those which your predecessor enjoyed. I shall not argue about the title of Administrator Apostolic which occurs in your letter of appointment referred to above; but I do beseech you to be pleased to indicate clearly to me in what letter or Brief you have received from the Holy Father the faculty to appoint a Vicar General for the time of your absence, as you positively assert in your favor of the 29th ult.; since in the aforementioned document there is not a word to that effect. I will add, moreover, that, in order to absent himself from his official residence for a protracted length of time, a person entrusted with a duty such as that which you discharge, must, according to the best canonists, have some great causes concerning the Church at large, and not a particular Church; and in the supposition that such causes be true, it is absolutely necessary, moreover, that beforehand a written permission should be asked from, and granted by the Holy Father, or at least the Metropolitan or the senior Bishop of the Province. In view of the foregoing remarks, I hope that you will do me the kindness to put at rest my conscience and that of others on this point. Were you to act otherwise, you would be answerable for all the evils which might ensue.

Ever your devoted servant,
P. ANTHONY DE SEDELLA.

*New Orleans, May 3,* 1815.

Was this "bluff" or ignorance on the part of the wily Capuchin? At any rate, Father Du Bourg condescended to answer once more:

*New Orleans, May 3,* 1815.

*Reverend Father:*

In reply to yours of this day, just received, I must first express my surprise that you did not advert to the difference between an Adminis-

trator Apostolic and an Administrator's Vicar General. My true predecessor was not Father Olivier, but the Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore, for whom I was substituted according to the Brief that I sent you: for it was not as Archbishop of Baltimore that he exercised jurisdiction over this vacant See, but because the Pope had especially entrusted this office to him, as he himself says; and the very words whereby faculty was given to the Archbishop to relieve himself of this burden by confiding it entirely to another person, declare the latter shall be regarded as sent in the name of the Holy See, and enjoy all the rights which were formally the Most Rev. Archbishop's. Now this Prelate unquestionably had the right to appoint a Vicar General; therefore, I also have that right. There you have, as well as from the general faculties granted to Prefects Apostolic in the Missions, which I mentioned in my last letter, the solid foundation upon which was grounded my assertion that I am empowered by the Pope to designate a substitute.

I am perfectly aware, Reverend Father, that an Ecclesiastical superior must have grave reasons to absent himself from his Diocese; but I am aware also of the fact that he is answerable for these reasons only to his superior. As a matter of fact, I have for this journey the assent of the Most Rev. Archbishop; but this was in no way necessary, for every superior has the right to go to Rome, in order to confer with the Head of the Church, and is accountable therefor to no one. Nevertheless, I, too, am too much a lover of peace, not to be disposed to communicate to you the Most Rev. Archbishop's letter on this subject. The letter is in English, but in it is enclosed another in Latin, addressed to His Eminence Card. Litta, Prefect of Propaganda, to whom I am to present it. This letter, and even both of them, I will show you readily, if you take the trouble to come here.

You may withal, Reverend Father, do as you please. I have satisfied my conscience, and am no longer responsible for the ominous consequences which your letter makes me anticipate; but these forebodings cannot deter me from undertaking my intended journey, as the interest of the Diocese, of which I am sole judge, appears to me to demand it.

I am respectfully,

Reverend Father,

Your most humble and devoted servant,

WM. DU BOURG.

P. S.—I beg you to understand that when I say: You may do as you please, my intention is by no means to countenance your departing from the order which, as Ordinary of this Diocese, I deemed it my duty to establish for the exercise of my jurisdiction during my absence. Having no exterior means of compelling the priests to submission, I can only bemoan their behavior before God, and make it known to His Holiness.

WM. DU BOURG.

The next day, May 4, the Administrator, his mind overcast by ill omens of what was but too likely to happen during his absence, sailed for Europe. He landed at Bordeaux at a most unpropitious moment (early in July, 1815), just when, after Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo (June 18) and his abdication (June 22), and the subsequent capitulation of Paris to Blücher (July 3), the whole country was in an uproar. To set out on a journey through distracted France would have been sheer rashness. Father Du Bourg, therefore, decided to wait at Bordeaux until travelling should be safe, and from the Archbishop's palace, where he was tendered the most generous hospitality, wrote to Card. Litta:[10]

*Bordeaux, July* 12, 1815.

*Your Eminence:*

From Louisiana, in North America, I set out some time ago to visit the *limina* of the holy Apostles, for the purpose to set forth personally before the Holy See the most wretched condition of this church long since bereft of Pastor, the administration of which was, by Apostolic authority, entrusted to my humble person. I just landed in France, where, owing to civil disturbances and the dangers attending travel, I am prevented, I do not know for how long, to pursue my journey. For this reason I have deemed it necessary to implore without delay Your Eminence's help, in order to obtain that, as soon as possible, by an act of the Apostolic authority provision might be made, at least temporarily, for the ecclesiastical government of that Diocese. Naturally I did not fail, just before my departure, to appoint as Vicar General a man remarkable by his piety and prudence, namely, the Rev. Louis Sibourd, formerly pastor in the French Island of San Domingo; and to him at once the missionaries of the State promised obedience—all but one. This man is the Spanish Capuchin Father Anthony de Sedella, concerning whom my predecessors had in the past grave complaints to make to the Holy Father, and I myself shall have much to say when I have an audience with Your Eminence. This man, impatient of control, and quite expert in the art of tickling the popular fancy, who, for thirty years and more has lorded it in the Cathedral, and holds and twists at will in his hand the minds of nearly all the inhabitants of a large city, this man, I say, challenging my power to delegate my authority, is, now that the first schism kindled by him has been quenched, threatening to start another. Unless treatment is promptly applied to this frightful calamity, the evil, I am afraid, will be soon past remedy.

The Administrator begged for a recognition of the lawfulness

[10] *Arch. of Propag., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Fol. 333.

of Father Sibourd's appointment, pointing out the necessity to abstain, for prudential reasons, from any reference, even indirect, to Father Anthony.

What the result of this petition was, we do not know in every detail; we can say only that the stand taken by the Administrator in this affair was undoubtedly approved: of this approval the fact that no sooner had Du Bourg reached the Eternal City (September, 1815), than he was made Bishop,[11] is sufficient evidence; moreover, a note of the Secretary of Propaganda written on the back of Du Bourg's letter informs us that the Congregation wrote on this subject to Archbishop Carroll on August 26 following.[12] Archbishop Carroll died on December 3, 1815, possibly before this letter reached him;[13] at any rate, it was Archbishop Neale who answered it, on February 4, 1816:[14]

> . . . Four letters sent from Rome . . . one dated August 26, 1815 . . . In this I noticed the commission given to the Archbishop to uphold without delay before the Catholics of Louisiana the authority of the Vicar General, Rev. Louis Sibourd, appointed by the Administrator to rule in his absence, against the attempts of Father Anthony, who claims the right to govern the Church of Louisiana until the Administrator's return.
>
> Now whilst I was considering what means of performing the commission laid upon me might prove the most effectual, I just received from the Rev. Louis Sibourd a letter telling me that Father Anthony has put an end to the trouble of which he was so long the cause, and ceased to exercise the jurisdiction he had usurped; so that there remains for me no necessity to interfere in the quarrel.

How short-lived Father Anthony's submission was, the sequel will manifest.

---

[11] He had been already appointed for the first time in 1812, shortly after being made Administrator, and had accepted the appointment. His Bulls, however, were delayed. Father Maréchal, then in France, wrote that he expected to be the bearer of them; but he returned to Baltimore without them. Pope Pius VII, lingering in prison, and worn out by the intrigues and harassing vexations of his imperial gaoler, firmly declined to issue any more Bulls. SPALDING, *Flaget*, pp. 163-164. A note informs us that all these particulars are gathered from a letter of Du Bourg to Bishop Flaget, dated Baltimore, August 11, 1812.

[12] This letter must be in the Archives of Baltimore.

[13] The matter might be ascertained if the date of receipt was entered on the original, or a Journal of the correspondence sent and received was kept. The point is of secondary importance.

[14] *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Ff. 360-364.

It does not fall within the scope of this paper to rehearse the various events which filled the days of Du Bourg's sojourn in Rome, to tell how, despite his reluctance, he was finally prevailed upon to receive episcopal consecration (September 24, 1815), and how his "refusal to take No for an answer" secured for his Diocese a band of missionaries and substantial pecuniary aid. When his first recruits left Rome (October 21[15] and December 15,[16] 1815) for Bordeaux, the understanding was they were to go with the Bishop to New Orleans. Great was their surprise, therefore, when, whilst waiting at Bordeaux for the prelate, they were informed by a letter written from Lyons on Easter Sunday (April 24), 1816, that the Bishop was abandoning his project of going, and taking them, to Lower Louisiana. This letter, addressed to Father De Andreis,[17] read in part as follows:

> I see you are all eager to sail. Yet, since I saw you last, I had decided our departure would not be before next October; and letters which I received from New Orleans recommend waiting until the above mentioned date, on account of the summer heat and the autumn fevers prevailing there, which would expose too much my precious colony. Nevertheless other more recent letters, which convey very sad news and tell of the darkest machinations of the *inimicus homo* who controls the religious opinions of that city, compel me to alter all my plans, and may bring about your departure at a much earlier date. . . .
>
> You know that when a general wishes to conquer a country, he does not always stop to besiege fortified cities, lest this should weaken his army and hamper at every step the progress of the campaign. According to this mode of strategy, I am considering leaving aside New Orleans, and attacking my Diocese at points more easy of access for me: instead of fixing my residence and my establishments in Lower Louisiana, it is to St. Louis, in Upper Louisiana, that I am thinking to go, at least for a while.
>
> . . . Many reasons convince me that, even apart from the opposition to be met with at New Orleans, the good of the Diocese suggests that St. Louis should have the preference as the Episcopal city. I think I am perfectly free in this regard, since, after all, I shall still be within the Diocese; however, for conscience's sake, I have written to Rome to have the opinion of Propaganda on this matter. Should the Holy See

---

[15] Fathers Rosati, C.M., Acquaroni, C.M., Spezioli, and Mr. Deys. Father Spezioli went no farther than Bordeaux.

[16] Fathers De Andreis, C.M., Marliani, Messrs. Dahmen and Gonzalez. At Bordeaux Father Marliani was found by the doctors unable to undertake the trip.

[17] Original in the *Archives of St. Louis Archdiocese Chancery.*

refuse to sanction this new plan of mine, I would consider our Mission as a rash undertaking, and the whole affair a wretched failure.

The letter to Rome to which reference is made by Bishop Du Bourg had been sent on 11th of April to Card. Dunagni, Pro-Prefect of Propaganda.[18] After thanking the Cardinal for a gift of 600 *scudi* voted by the Congregation at the Pro-Prefect's instance, and registering the success obtained so far, the Bishop of Louisiana broaches the subject of his intended change of residence:

The news which I received from New Orleans would almost make me give up the whole undertaking. The *inimicus homo*, on hearing of my appointment, renewed and multiplied his perfidious wiles. There is now question of having the State Legislature pass a law placing my temporalities under the absolute control of the men most strenuously opposed to Episcopal authority; and so heated are the minds of the party, that my friends entertain fears about my personal safety, should I appear in the City. Your Eminence may realize easily what distress such news caused me. I must say candidly that I came very near beseeching His Holiness to take away from my shoulders a burden which, in circumstances such as these, appeared to me simply unbearable.

Unbearable it would be, indeed, Your Eminence, for the most courageous and fearless Bishop, if he were obliged to settle in the city of New Orleans, or even in Lower Louisiana, which is almost entirely under the influence of that wretched Religious. Nothing at all can be hoped there as long as that man is living. However, I feel how essential it is not to give up the hope of bringing back some day by dint of meekness that part of the Diocese under submission to Episcopal authority. But this consideration itself positively forbids exposing the Bishop to an uneven struggle, the inevitable result of which can be only the loss of the respect due to his dignity. I see but one means of reconciling all the interests at stake, and I beg Your Eminence kindly to propose this means to the Cardinal Prefect and to the Sacred Congregation: it is, that I should for the time being establish my See in Upper Louisiana, namely, at St. Louis. Apart from the peremptory motive which brought this idea to my mind, several other reasons seem sufficiently strong to recommend this measure. In order that I may work thoroughly for the good of my Diocese, I must establish a Seminary and primary schools: these new establishments ought to be, until they are solidly grounded, under the immediate and constant supervision of the Bishop. Now everything is against their being located in Lower Louisiana, whereas everything looks favorable to their happy development if they be in Upper Louisiana: in the one place morality is at an incredibly low ebb, it remains untainted

[18] *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Fol. 369.

in the other; in the one the air is unsalubrious, it is pure and healthy in the other; in the one real estate and living are very high, they are very cheap in the other. In case I were to settle in Upper Louisiana, I would appoint only a Vicar General at New Orleans, requesting His Holiness through the Sacred Congregation to grant him the faculty to administer *as I would deem fit* the Sacrament of Confirmation, as the immense distance between the place of my residence and Lower Louisiana would prevent my betaking me thither to fulfill this august function of my Order. In this case, too, it would be necessary to postpone indefinitely the carrying to execution of the project which I had suggested to the Sacred Congregation touching the dismemberment of Upper Louisiana from my Diocese and its erection into a new Diocese.

Bishop Du Bourg's plea was accepted; and from a note of the Secretary of the Congregation of Propaganda added to the original of the above letter, we learn that, in May, 1816, the Cardinal Prefect wrote his approval of the prelate's project. But communications were then very slow; the Bishop, moreover, whose nerves were constantly kept on edge by the correspondence he received from America, was naturally anxious that Rome should be in possession of all the information bearing on the case. He, therefore, on June 24, renewed his petition in another letter to Cardinal Dunagni, adding new light on the misdeeds of Father Anthony and his clique:[19]

*Your Eminence:*

I had the honor of writing to you from Lyons about the end of April, to acquaint you with the sad news I had just received from New Orleans, submit to you the plan I had formed to establish my residence, at least for a while, in the town of St. Louis, and beseech you to forward as soon as possible your answer to Bordeaux. Since that time, I have been constantly assailed by letters from the same quarter, all very dispiriting, and the trustworthiness of whose writers I cannot question, for these persons are precisely those who are most devoted to me, namely, my brothers, my Vicar General, the Ursuline nuns and others. The uniform burden of all these letters is that, when the news of my Episcopal consecration reached over there, the party began to stir themselves to have the State Legislature pass a law enacting that the Cathedral should be administered by a Board of Trustees, all naturally Father Anthony's abettors;—that, besides, the ringleaders have so roused all the classes of the people against the coming of a Bishop, that my friends believe it would be unsafe for me to go there; at least access to the Cathedral would be denied me, and the Episcopal dignity would be ignominiously

[19] *Arch. of Prop. l.c.*, Cod. 3, Ff. 372-373.

outraged;—that, when my Vicar General brought to Father Anthony the Testimonial of my Consecration and the Brief of His Holiness raising me to the Episcopate, in order to have them registered and filed in the Cathedral Archives, Father Anthony replied derisively that he would consult about the matter with the trustees, one of whom had, shortly after, the impudence to take these documents to a saloon and, on the occasion of them, to aim gibes and insults at the Holy Father and the Bishop;—that Father Anthony boasts that he has nothing to do with the Pope and the Bishops of his making;—that, however, by an unconceivable inconsistency, or maybe a remnant of political timidity, not only he accepts matrimonial dispensations issued in my name by my Vicar General, but even refuses to bless marriages in need of dispensation, until the parties have secured this dispensation from the lawful authority. So that, on the whole, there is actually no schism, but everything is ready for starting one at the first provocation; and the appearance of the Bishop in the country shall not fail to be the signal; so that, not only the respect due to the Episcopal dignity, but the vital interests of religion as well, shall be jeopardized; which must be avoided at all costs, because once the mischief is done, it will be impossible to mend it. From this I might be led to conclude that God does not wish me in my Diocese; and I would not have hesitated to send my resignation to His Holiness, had not the thought occurred to me that St. Louis may offer me a residence where I may settle with greater profit to religion than could ever be found in New Orleans.

However, Your Eminence, before going there, I deemed it necessary to make sure of the kind of welcome I might expect there; for I am told also that the coterie at New Orleans have spared no efforts to poison the minds of the country-people, and as much as they could, of the whole Diocese. In consequence, I have written to Bishop Flaget of Kentucky, who is highly esteemed in Upper Louisiana, and who, being well acquainted with the dispositions of the people there, solicited the erection of a new Episcopal See in that district; I have requested him to urge those people to express themselves plainly, and assign to the Bishop a maintenance independent from the caprice and humor of his flock. My opinion is accordingly that I should wait for their answer before definitely determining to go there.

Upon these various points it is extremely urgent, Your Eminence, that I should have as soon as possible the directions of the Sacred Congregation; for without these directions I act only at haphazard, being obliged to rely solely on my own judgment. I consulted, however, the most enlightened and wise French prelates and ecclesiastics; and all approved of my plan.

Meanwhile, I did not fail to further the work of my Mission; and I have just sent to Upper Louisiana, by the way of Baltimore and Ken-

tucky, five priests, four clerics in minor Orders, and four Brothers,[20]— all well-tried men, to whom I have explained the exact condition of things. Ten or twelve more may possibly be ready to sail by October next; but I will not send these without fear, if I have not the opinion of the Sacred Congregation. I beseech Your Eminence, therefore, to take my position into serious consideration, and, after conferring with the Cardinals of the Congregation on the foregoing *exposé*, to forward me as soon as possible their answer to the following three questions:

1. Owing to the certainty that the Episcopal dignity will be reviled, and to the extremely strong probability that I may personally be exposed to serious danger in New Orleans, is it not advisable to fix, at least provisionally, my residence in St. Louis?

2. Ought I not to wait, before going to St. Louis, for an assurance that I shall be well received there, and find a maintenance?

3. Should I likewise delay until then the departure of the Missionaries who have offered to share in my labors?

Anent the first query, I do not see how there could be two opinions. All persons conversant with the conditions are unanimously saying that attempting to go first to New Orleans would be inexcusable rashness, and a death-blow to Religion. As for myself, Your Eminence, who know better than anyone both the place and the men, I must declare that I do not feel equal to the task of exposing myself to the consequences of such a step.

With regard to the second question, it does not seem to me that the Church's intention is that a Bishop should be a beggar. If the hope of having a resident Bishop does not move the people of Upper Louisiana to settle something definite for his maintenance, still less will they be disposed to do anything, once he is with them, and they know he cannot go anywhere else. I believe it necessary, in consequence, that they should come out with a plain statement, before I go there. Already in April Bishop Flaget has broached the subject, and we may probably know the result of his negotiations before the end of the year.

The solution of the third question depends, in my opinion, upon the answer given to the second. However, I would not see so much inconvenience in an early start of the Missionaries who, at any rate, wish to go to America and are sure of finding work there, than in my own departure at haphazard. This measure may even be necessary for the encouragement of the benefactors of the Mission who seem to reckon on that early start. If, after all, it turns out that I cannot follow my destination, the money given me will thus nevertheless be faithfully applied according to the intention of the donors.

[20] Fathers De Andreis, C.M., Rosati, C.M., Acquaroni, C.M., Carretti and Ferrari of Port-Maurice; Messrs. Dahmen, Deys, Gonzalez and Tichitoli; Blanka, C.M., Flegifont, Boranvanski, de Latre; of these four men only the first was actually a lay-brother, the other three had manifested some intention of joining the Community; none of them eventually persevered. All sailed, on June 12, 1816, on the American brig *The Ranger*.

This letter reached Rome on August 17. We are not in possession of the Cardinal's reply; but from the subsequent correspondence of the Bishop, we may gather that Rome approved of his waiting for Bishop Flaget's information, and directed him to send his Missionaries at once.[21] Anticipating such an answer, he resolved to undertake a campaign through France and Belgium in view of collecting funds and recruiting subjects for the Mission. The King of France, Louis XVIII, granted him free passage for himself and all his Missionaries on the first ship of the Royal navy to sail for America.

Did the authorities at Rome forget the difficult circumstances in which he was, and the approval given to his delaying his departure? It would seem so, from a letter of Propaganda, dated November 23, expressing the Congregation's dissatisfaction, because, "instead of starting for his Diocese, according to the *orders* given him, he had gone to Paris." This unmerited censure caused a severe wound to his sensitive nature; and at once he poured out his heart's feelings in a letter to the Cardinal Pro-Prefect, in which he explained and justified the course he had taken.[22] This letter, received in Rome in the first days of February, produced the desired effect; the mistake was acknowledged, and regret expressed for its commission. But this comforting news had not yet reached the Bishop at the end of March; his heart's wound still bleeding, he once more appealed to the Cardinal:[23]

[21] "I conformed, my Lord, to the orders of Your Eminence on these two points. I have already sent forth thirteen ecclesiastics, nine to St. Louis" (De Andreis' band) "and four to New Orleans." Letter to Card. Dunagni, December, 1816. *Arch. of Prop., l.c., Cod.* 3, Ff. 387-388. Three of the latter, two Frenchmen and one Italian, died prematurely in the fall of 1817. Letter of Father Rosati to Father Baccari, Bardstown, February 8, 1818.

[22] Lyons, December 28, 1816. *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Ff. 387-388. We date this letter with certainty, December 28, although the original bears no date; because, according to a Postcript, Bishop Du Bourg sent at the same time his "Opinion on marriage licences issued by civil authorities in the U. S." This document, which has found place only in Fol. 400 of the *Cod.*, is explicitly dated, Lyons, December 28, 1816. Let it be remarked in passing that the index of this letter in Prof. Carl Russell Fish's *Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives*, p. 177 (Washington, D. C., 1911), is misleading: "The Bishop of New Orleans," says the *Guide*, "gives his reasons for *wishing to be transferred to Paris*" (italics mine) "and exposes his projects." The fact of the matter is that the Bishop gives his reasons why he went to Paris, which is quite different.

[23] *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Fol. 425.

*Paris, March* 29, 1817.

*My Lord Cardinal:*

Over two months ago, being then at Lyons, I wrote to Your Eminence, to endeavor to clear myself in your eyes of the charge of disobedience. You had upbraided me for my failure to follow your orders of repairing at once to my Diocese. My answer to this allegation was in Your Eminence's very last two letters, wherein you deemed it prudent for me to delay my departure until I should hear about the outcome of the negotiations started by the Bishop of Bardstown with the inhabitants of St. Louis of the Illinois, on the subject of establishing there, at least for a while, my Episcopal See.

If meanwhile I went to Paris, I take God to witness it was in no way for the purpose of winning the good graces of the Royal family, or for any human advantage; but solely for the spiritual benefit of my poor Diocese. Indeed, I went not only to Paris, but also to Belgium, to secure everywhere I could both active laborers and help of every kind; and, thank God, my efforts were not fruitless.

For, besides the thirteen men already arrived in my Diocese[24] (among whom are Fathers De Andreis, Rosati and Acquaroni, of the Roman house of the Mission, Flavian Rossi and Aloysius Bighi, of the Roman College), twenty and more ecclesiastics are ready to sail with me, with whose help we will be able to provide in some way for the foundation of the Seminary and the personnel of the Missions. Moreover, with regard to the expense, His Most Christian Majesty will furnish a ship, the Princes and some good Christians money and a supply of sacred utensils—a very nice liberality in the present straitened circumstances. Nothing now detains me, except that I have to wait for the favorable season to set sail; in May, therefore, or, at the latest, in June next, God willing, we shall be on our way to Baltimore, whence we will go overland and by river-boats to St. Louis.

In the meantime, I hear frequently from my Vicar General who stays all alone in New Orleans: so far, no change has been noticed in the ill-feeling of my opponents; and whatever persons in that depraved city are well disposed towards religion approve my plan to settle in Upper Louisiana, in order that the Episcopal dignity may not be discredited.

It being so, it appears to me urgent that Your Eminence carry out the intention which you were pleased once to manifest to me, namely, to obtain for me from the Holy Father the faculty of delegating a priest to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, consecrate chalices and altars for that portion of the Diocese which, on account both of the distance and of the hostility still prevailing, I shall be unable to visit.

I had just written this much, when Your Eminence's most welcome and truly fatherly letter of the 5th of February was handed to me. It

[24] So did Bishop Du Bourg think; he did not know then that Bishop Flaget had advised them to wait at Bardstown.

was like balm on my perhaps oversensitive heart, which had felt the wound smarting all the more, because the hand that inflicted it was the dearer. Deign Your Eminence pardon the pain of a son, who beheld him whom he used to look upon as a father, suddenly and without cause that he knew of, assume the stern looks of a judge. Well, God, who is always good, permitted it all, I am sure, to give me a new token of your kindness and of your affection: words fail me to express my gratitude therefor to Your Eminence. No more complaints that my confidence had grown strained. Nay, would that it never overstep the proper bounds of filial confidence.

. . . Whence may have arisen the fear that I should obey the promptings of love of country rather than those of pastoral duty? I have not the least idea, nor do I care to investigate. I even pardon this insult the more readily, because it has afforded me keen satisfaction to hear I have in America friends so good as to set so much value on my worthless efforts. . . .

Bishop Du Bourg's expectations as to the date of his departure were somewhat disappointed. On June 16, he wrote joyfully: "At length the long-wished-for day is at hand: to-morrow we embark, and, God willing, shall set sail for America."[25] Yet, for some cause unexplained in our documents, *La Caravane*, a "flute" of the French Royal Navy, left her moorings at Bordeaux only on July 1.[26] With the prelate were twenty-nine recruits for the Louisiana Mission: five priests, four subdeacons, nine clerics, three Christian Brothers, four young men still in their classical course, and four workmen, who had offered themselves to the Mission and whom the Bishop intended to organize into a kind of community of mechanics.[27]

[25] Letter to Prop. *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Fol. 453.

[26] There can be no doubt as to this date, given by Bishop Spalding, *Flaget*, p. 172. A letter of Mr. Portier and another of Father Anthony Blanc, cited in the *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, Vol. ii, No. 5, p. 62, and Vol. ii, pp. 334-335, respectively, state explicitly the voyage lasted sixty-five days; and it is certain, on the other hand, that the party landed at Annapolis on September 4.

[27] Various estimates of the number of persons who came on *La Caravane* are current. The list here given is copied from a scrap of paper scribbled in 1820 by Father Rosati, and containing, obviously for his own use and *ne pereant*, the names of all those who came to the Louisiana Mission between 1816 and 1820, with the date of their arrival. This list, which aims at completeness, must be assumed to be correct. It is preserved in the Archives of the Archdiocese of St. Louis. Priests: De Crugy, Anthony Blanc, Janvier, De la Croix, Vallesano; Subdeacons: Bertrand, Portier, Jeanjean, Valentin; Clerics: Brassac, Desmoulins, Hosten, Niel, De Parcq, Maenhaut, De Nekere, Perrodin, Chaudorat; Christian Brothers: Audin, Fulgentius, Antoninus; College Boys: Barreau, De Geithre, Desprat, Magne; of the four workmen we have only the first names: Joseph, Bernard, Isidore, Francis.

The company's life on board ship was as regular and edifying as that of the most fervent seminary; and by word and example the Missionaries inaugurated their apostolic work among their providential travelling companions of *La Caravane*. What consoling success crowned their zealous endeavors, we learn from a letter of Father Anthony Blanc, the future Bishop of New Orleans:[28]

> Our voyage was a little long; but we never regretted this delay, because it was undoubtedly brought about by a special disposition of God, who wished to give us time to prepare the sailors who desired to take the opportunity of our presence on board to fulfill their religious duties. Every day we had a catechetical instruction for the benefit of all who wanted to attend. The first instruction was given by the Bishop himself to the whole crew assembled. We could not but admire the attention with which these poor people were listening. On August 24, eve of St. Louis' feast, the Bishop officiated in the largest and least encumbered room of the ship, and we had the consolation to see forty of the crewmen sit at the Holy Table, seven of whom were making their first communion. Thirty-four of these men received on the same day the sacrament of Confirmation with the most edifying dispositions. In the evening we had a renewal of the promises of Baptism made by those forty who, that morning, had received communion: the Bishop asked the question, and all answered in a loud and manly tone of voice: We promise it! This ceremony was touching in the extreme, and affected deeply the officers, some of whom confessed later on that, on going back to their cabins they could not refrain from shedding tears. On the following Sunday, a few went again to Holy Communion. Most of these men were above twenty-five years of age; a few were around fifty, and said they had neglected their duty for thirty years. We all had our share in this work, some giving the instructions, others hearing confessions. For my own part, I signed seventeen Confirmation tickets. Before we left the ship, they asked us for rosary-beads, which afterwards all were carrying around their necks.

Most touching was the parting scene at Annapolis, when, the Bishop bidding adieu to these neophytes, all fell on their knees and asked a last farewell blessing. "God," adds the chronicler of the *Annales*, "did not wish to expose these good men to the danger of once more losing their souls; on her return trip to France, *La Caravane* was assailed by a fierce hurricane, and nearly all the crew perished at sea."[29]

[28] *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, Vol. ii, pp. 334-335. Cf. Letter of M. Portier, the future Bishop of Mobile: *op. cit.*, t. i, No. 5, p. 62.

[29] *Ann. de la Prop. de la Foi*, Vol. i, No. 1, p. 18.

The safe arrival of the Du Bourg party was notified at once by Father Bruté to Bishop Flaget, who was requested to set out directly with Fathers De Andreis and Rosati, then his guests at Bardstown, in order to make the requisite arrangements for the Bishop's reception and maintenance and for the establishment of the Mission. The whole trip, made on horseback, and lasting from October 1 to November 6, proved one of the most arduous that the stout-hearted Flaget had ever undertaken; but he was wont to look upon hardships as the coin wherewith success is purchased; indeed the success of the delicate negotiations he had come to engage far exceeded his most sanguine anticipations.[30]

The Bishop of Louisiana, after some time spent at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore (September 10–November 4),[31] set out, on November 4, on his journey westwards, and, on the evening of December 2, accompanied by Father Blanc, and two Kentucky priests[32] sent to Louisville from Bardstown to welcome him, had the happiness of embracing his old friends Bishop Flaget and Father David, and his first company of missioners who had been for a long year awaiting his coming.

He was anxious to get "home." It was agreed that the tireless Bishop of Bardstown should introduce him to his people and install him in his cathedral. Accordingly, on the 12th of December, the two prelates, Father Badin and Mr. Niel, one of the students for the Louisiana Mission,[33] started for St. Louis. The following Sunday (December 14), Bishop Du Bourg preached in the chapel erected by Father Badin at Louisville; and, four days later, the travellers embarked on the steamboat *Piqua*, in hope of completing the voyage in seven days and reaching St. Louis

---

[30] SPALDING, *Flaget*, pp. 170-171; *Life of De Andreis*, pp. 170–173.

[31] On landing, he left under the care of Father Blanc some of his companions at Annapolis, where they were entertained with princely hospitality until the end of October in the mansion of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. From Annapolis and Baltimore, the party, with the exception of Mr. Portier, who remained at St. Mary's Seminary, went by stage, in three successive bands (the Bishop being in the last) to Pittsburgh, where they embarked on a flat-boat, reaching Louisville on November 30th.

[32] Fathers Chabrat and Schaefer.

[33] Nowhere is that student's name given; it is certain nevertheless the young man was Mr. Francis Niel, later on pastor of St. Louis. He is mentioned by Bishop Du Bourg in a letter to Father Rosati, April 22, 1818, as being in St. Louis.

just for Christmas. Bishop Flaget's humorous pen-picture of the *Piqua* is worth quoting here:

> Nothing could be more original than the medley of persons on board this boat. We have a band of seven or eight comedians, a family of seven or eight Jews, and a company of clergymen composed of a tonsured cleric, a priest, and two Bishops; besides others, both white and black. Thus more than thirty persons are lodged in an apartment (cabin) twenty feet by twelve, which is again divided into two parts. This boat comprises the old and the new testament. It might serve successively for a synagogue, a cathedral, a theater, an hospital, a parlor, a dining room, and a sleeping apartment. It is in fact, a veritable *Noah's Ark*, in which there are both clean and unclean animals—and what is most astonishing, peace and harmony reign here.[34]

The travellers' expectations of a speedy journey were doomed to failure; owing to excessive cold weather, the navigation was seriously hampered by huge ice-floes, and even for two full days the boat was stuck fast in the middle of the river. When, on December 24, painfully the craft reached at last the mouth of the Ohio, the prospect looked still gloomier; and indeed, as the voyagers rose up the next morning they realized with dismay they had not progressed an inch. Unable to say their Christmas Masses, they resolved to make three meditations instead. At the conclusion of the second, the proud *Piqua* resumed her course towards her goal. Slowly she ploughed her way northward, and at length, on the evening of the 28th of December she arrived at the landing near Mrs. Fenwick's farm,[35] where she was to stop a few hours.

There it was the Bishop of Louisiana first set foot in his Diocese. Near the spot a cross prepared for the occasion was solemnly erected whilst the Prelates and their two companions sang the *Vexilla Regis*.[36]

---

[34] SPALDING, *Flaget*, pp. 173-174.

[35] On the north side of the mouth of Apple-Creek, in Perry Co., Mo. Cf. Letter of Bishop Du Bourg to Father Rosati, St. Louis, April 22, 1818. *Archives of St. Louis Archdiocese.*

[36] Letter of Father A. Blanc. *Ann. de la Prop. de la Foi*, Vol. ii, p. 336. Father Blanc repeatedly intimates that the details which he gives were furnished by a letter of Bishop Flaget to Bardstown. Father Rosati's account, in a letter to Father Baccari, dated February 7, 1818, is much more summary; he refers to the same source of information. We shall follow these two guides very closely in the next few pages.

At Fenwick's Father Badin parted with the company. Only twenty miles away lay the "Barrens," where, some twenty years before, a number of his old Kentucky parishioners—as also were the Fenwicks—had come to settle. The occasion to see them was too good to miss; to the "Barrens," therefore, he directed his steps, intending to overtake the Episcopal party a few days later at St. Genevieve.

Returning to the boat, the Bishops "found the comedians performing a play—that is, engaged in a general fight among themselves—until they were separated by the captain."[37] At midnight, on the 30th, they arrived in view of St. Genevieve, and early next morning they despatched a messenger to announce their coming to Father De Andreis.[38] Two hours later, the latter, accompanied by some forty of the principal inhabitants, went on horseback to the landing with several young men likewise on horseback, and a carriage, to escort the prelates into the town. They repaired first to the rectory, where they donned their pontifical vestments; and, a few moments later, headed by the cross and twenty-four altar-boys, the two Bishops, under a canopy carried by four of the principal citizens, were, to the accompaniment of the peal of the church-bells and amidst the universal joy of all the parish assembled, and even of many Protestant members of the community, conducted in solemn procession to the throne erected in the sanctuary of the little village church. With that felicitous cleverness which always put on his lips the right words for the right place, Bishop Du Bourg opened his heart to his St. Genevieve audience, expressing his delight that he was at last in his Diocese, among his own spiritual children, and auguring from this happy event great progress for religion in Upper Louisiana. An enthusiastic *Te Deum* closed the ceremony, and the rest of the day was spent in receiving visits.

On the 1st of January, 1818, the Catholics of St. Genevieve witnessed for the first time the splendors of a Pontifical Mass, cele-

[37] SPALDING, *Flaget*, p. 174.

[38] As a result of the arrangements made by Bishop Flaget at St. Louis in October, Father Henry Pratte, pastor of St. Genevieve, had been summoned to St. Louis, to superintend the repairing of the church and rectory; Father De Andreis went to St. Genevieve to take his place.

brated by their Bishop, who once more preached to them; and the next day, the two prelates, Father Badin, who had joined them after his short visit to the "Barrens" settlement, Father De Andreis and Mr. Niel, crossing over to Illinois, resumed their journey towards St. Louis. They arrived the next evening (Saturday, January 3) at Cahokia, where they were welcomed with unbounded transports of joy.[39]

Monday, January 5, had been fixed for the last link of the journey. Forty men of Cahokia, mounted on superb chargers, and marching two by two in perfect order, led the pageant to the bank of the Mississippi River, where a boat was in readiness.[40] On the Missouri side, a large crowd of people, in fact all the inhabitants of the town, Protestants as well as Catholics, were anxiously waiting at the landing;[41] and with faces beaming with joy, after welcoming the prelates in the best French style, led them to the "Episcopal palace," still a sorry looking tumble-down stone house,[42] in spite of Father Pratte's best exertions. Soon after, the two Bishops, mitred and clad in their full pontifical robes, came down the steps, were received under a canopy, and preceded by twelve altar-boys, marched to the gate, and turning northwards along the *Rue de l'Eglise*—now Second Street—reached the door of the cathedral—the rickety log-building erected in 1776—and went up to the sanctuary, where a throne had been prepared, whilst the people filled the church to overflowing. Then Bishop Flaget, leading Bishop Du Bourg to the throne, and installing him in his Episcopal chair, congratulated him on his being now in the midst of his beloved children. The sight of the Pastor, now at last at the end of his two thousand

[39] Father Blanc, in his narrative confounds here Cahokia and Kaskaskias. What he says of the venerable pastor was written indeed about Father Donatian Olivier by the Ladies of the Sacred Heart who paid a visit to the pastor of Prairie du Rocher (of which Kaskaskias was then an out-mission) early in 1818. This description, in very truth, needs no alterations to fit good old Father Savine, then pastor of Cahokia. All these French pioneer priests were of the same sturdy spiritual stock.

[40] A ferry was then plying between the two banks of the river; but the notice intimates a private boat was sent for the Bishop's party.

[41] There was one landing at the foot of Market Street, and another farther north, at the foot of what now is Morgan Street. No doubt the Bishop's party came to the Market Street landing, only a short distance from the cathedral.

[42] "Le palais episcopal . . . ressemble assez à une misérable grange." *Ann. de a Prop. de la Foi*, Vol. i, No. 1, p. 19.

league journey, the view of the flock which he had loved so dearly in the days of their spiritual destitution, and the comforting thought they would henceforth never be in want of religious help, so enraptured the zeal-consumed soul of the speaker, that he could not check tears of bliss and hope. For twenty-four years, the Catholics of St. Louis had known him, from the far-distant day of his coming to Vincennes, his first mission, and they idolized him; but so delicately did he speak to them of their Bishop whom it had been his rôle to herald, that their hearts were completely won to their new pastor.

That this was no mean victory of the eloquence, and still more of the magnetic personality of the Kentucky prelate, Bishop Du Bourg could judge better than anyone else. He had not been, indeed, entirely without misgivings, for he was well aware that the pestilential blast poisoning the Catholic atmosphere in New Orleans had been wafted as far as St. Louis. But this was now past history. Bishop Du Bourg's own winsome personality completed the victory so well won by the eloquent Flaget: "The mere presence of the Bishop," says Father De Andreis, "his kindness, benignity and suavity of manner have dispelled the storm, dissipated in a great measure every prejudice, and captivated all hearts."[43]

Bishop Flaget's mission was now happily completed. On the feast of the Epiphany he preached his farewell sermon, and the next day, in company with Father Badin, he started back for Bardstown by the way of Vincennes. Now at home, Bishop Du Bourg soon was to prove himself, in Upper Louisiana, the efficient instrument of Him "who commands the light to shine out of darkness."

CHARLES L. SOUVAY, C.M.,
*Kenrick Seminary,*
*St. Louis, Mo.*

[43] Letter to Father Sicardi, February 21, 1818.